

V. REMARKS

The Office Action objects to the drawing figures under 37 CFR 1.83 (a). The Office Action alleges that the drawing figures failed to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Optus Action asserts that the features of claims 2 and 6 are not shown in the drawing figures. It is respectfully submitted that these features are indeed shown in the drawing figures and particularly in drawing Figure 4. Figures 2 and 4 show a pair of endless chains 10a spaced apart from one another near the idler sprocket wheels 17 at a spacing distance L_1 and near the transfer control mechanism 40 a spacing distance L_2 . In paragraph [0024] on page 8 of the specification, it states:

According to a feature of this invention, the spacing L_1 , FIG. 4, between the second pair of idler sprocket wheels 17, and therefore between the first pair of idler sprocket wheels 16, is somewhat less than the spacing L_2 between the pair of drive sprocket wheels 18. Thus the pair of endless chains 10_a of the first conveyor 10 diverge apart as they run from the second pair of idler sprocket wheels 17 to the pair of drive sprocket wheels 18. The difference between these spacings L_1 and L_2 should be such that it does not adversely affect the smooth travel of the conveyor chains 10_a over the three pairs of sprocket wheels 16-18. As required, an additional pair of idler sprocket wheels may be provided as at 56 in FIGS. 2 and 4 in order to prevent upper flights of the conveyor chains 10_a from sagging between the sprocket wheel pairs 16 and 18.

It is respectfully submitted that not only does the drawing figures illustrate the claimed features, albeit not with exacting precision, but also such features are described in the specification. Specifically, paragraph [0024] states that the pair of endless chains 10_a of the first conveyor 10 diverge apart as they run from the second pair of idler sprocket wheels 17 to the pair of drive sprocket wheels 18. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that there is no need to correct or add drawing figures to the application to show the features of claims 2 and 6.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kramer

et al. (US Patent Number 6,254,088). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kramer teaches an apparatus for manufacturing printed products by insetting at least one subproduct and/or inserts into a main product. The apparatus includes a conveying unit and a transfer unit. The conveying unit has revolving gripping members for picking up at least the main products at a delivery of a printing machine and transfers the products on a conveying path to revolving insetting pockets of an insetting machine. The conveying unit comprises an intermediate storage arrangement having an insertion side and a delivery side, a first conveyor connected to the insertion side of the intermediate storage arrangement for taking up the products at the delivery of the printing machine and a second conveyor at the delivery side of the intermediate storage arrangement for feeding the insetting pockets of the insetting machine. The transfer unit can be switched on and off for connecting the first conveyor between the delivery of the printing machine and the intermediate storage arrangement to the second conveyor. The transfer unit includes clamps fastened to revolving traction device.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a conveyor system for transportation of articles from a first to a second station that includes a first conveyor, a second conveyor and means for driving the first and the second conveyor independently of each other. Claim 1 recites that the first conveyor has a pair of endless chains with each having a series of first grippers mounted thereto in transverse alignment with first grippers on the other endless chain. Claim 1 further recites that each transversely aligned pair of first grippers conjointly grip an article at two spaced points on one edge thereof in a loading position adjacent the first station and releases the article in a transfer position intermediate the first and the second station. Also, Claim 1 recites that the second conveyor has an endless chain having a series of second grippers mounted thereto with each second gripper gripping, in the transfer position, an article at a point on the edge thereof intermediate the two spaced points where the article has been gripped by one pair of first grippers on the first conveyor and releases the article at the second station.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a first conveyor having a pair of endless chains with each having a series of first grippers mounted thereto in transverse alignment with first grippers on the other endless chain. Also, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach that each transversely aligned pair of first grippers conjointly grip an article at two spaced points on one edge thereof in a loading position adjacent a first station. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a second conveyor having an endless chain with a series of second grippers mounted thereto with each second gripper gripping, in a transfer position, an article at a point on the edge thereof intermediate the two spaced points where the article has been gripped by one pair of first grippers on the first conveyor. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 5 is directed to a web-fed printing press with a conveyor system to be disposed downstream of a delivery fan for receiving signatures therefrom and transporting the same to the next processing station that includes a first conveyor, a second conveyor and means for driving the first and the second conveyor independently of each other. Claim 5 recites that the first conveyor has a pair of endless chains with each having a series of pairs of grip fingers mounted thereto in transverse alignment with like pairs of grip fingers on the other endless chain and with each transversely aligned pair of grip fingers being opened and closed in a loading position downstream of the delivery fan for conjointly gripping a signature at two spaced points on one edge thereof and releasing the signature in a transfer position intermediate the delivery fan and the next processing station. Claim 5 further recites that the second conveyor has an endless chain having a series of pairs of grip jaws mounted thereto with each pair of grip jaws being opened and closed in the transfer position for gripping the signature at a point on the edge thereof intermediate the two spaced points where the signature has been gripped by one transversely aligned pair of pairs of grip fingers on the first conveyor and releases the signature at the next processing station.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 5. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a first conveyor having a pair of endless chains with each having a series of pairs of grip fingers mounted thereto in transverse alignment with like pairs of grip fingers on the other endless chain and with each transversely aligned pair of grip fingers being opened and closed in a loading position downstream of the delivery fan for conjointly gripping a signature at two spaced points on one edge thereof. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a second conveyor having an endless chain with a series of pairs of grip jaws mounted thereto with each pair of grip jaws being opened and closed in the transfer position for gripping the signature at a point on the edge thereof intermediate the two spaced points where the signature has been gripped by one transversely aligned pair of pairs of grip fingers on the first conveyor. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5 and include all of the features of claim 5. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason the independent claims are allowable as well as for the features they recite. For instance, claims 2 and 6 recite that the pair of endless chains of the first conveyor diverge apart as they extend from the loading to the transfer position.


Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claims 9 and 10 that depend from claims 1 and 5 respectively also include features not shown in the applied art.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,



David T. Nikaido
Reg. No. 22,663

Date: August 2, 2005

By:

Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal

DC202540.DOC